

REMARKS

Claims 1-35 were presented for examination. In an Office Action dated October 20, 2006, claims 1-35 were rejected. Applicants herein amend claims 2, 5, 9-18, and 20-35, add claims 36-39, and cancel claims 1 and 19.

OBJECTIONS TO THE DRAWINGS

Figure 1 has been corrected, as requested, to remove reference number 114. With respect to reference number 108 in Figure 1, the terms “computer-readable medium” and “memory” have been used in paragraph 11 of the specification to refer to the same element 108 in Figure 1.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 19-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. While Applicants dispute the Examiner’s contention that transmission signals are not patentable subject matter, in the interest of expediting the application, Applicants have amended claims 19-35 to recite a “computer readable storage medium.”

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(B)

Claims 1-2, 12-15, 17-20, 30-33 and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being unpatentable over Belfiore (U.S. Patent No. 6,009,459). Applicants respectfully traverse this ground of rejection. Applicants have canceled claims 1 and 19 and have amended claims 2, 5, 9-18, and 20-35 and added claims 36-39.

As to the amended independent claims 2, 18, and 20, Belfiore fails to disclose “displaying the first article identifier and an additional article identifier included within the first article.”

Claim 2, as amended, recites a method comprising:

receiving a term in an input field;

generating a user context-dependent search query based at least in part on a user context and the term, the search query for searching an article index for a first article identifier identifying a first article associated with the term;

receiving the first article identifier;

displaying in a transient menu associated with the input field the first article identifier and **an additional article identifier included within the first article**, the additional article identifier associated with an additional article.

Claim 18 and 20, as amended, recite similar limitations to those recited in claim 2.

Belfiore generally discusses “a method for automatically initiating a search for a resource such as a web site when a user has specified (entered) text that is not a valid identifier for the resource.” (Belfiore, col. 2, lines 12-16) Belfiore does not disclose, however, “displaying the first article identifier and an additional article identifier included within the first article.”

At best, Belfiore discusses the display of a menu of search results (column 8, lines 1-11). Nowhere does Belfiore mention, however, that the display of the search result menu includes displaying an additional article identifier included within the first article, wherein the additional article identifier is associated with an additional article.

Therefore, claims 2, 18, and 20 patentably distinguish over Belfiore for at least these reasons. Claims 12-15, 17, 36, and 37 depend, either directly or indirectly from claim 2.

Claims 38 and 39 depend, either directly or indirectly from claim 18. Claims 30-33 and 35 depend, either directly or indirectly from claim 20. All of these dependent claims also include recitations that further define the claimed invention. Based on their dependence on the independent claims and other patentable recitations, these dependent claims are also patentable.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(A)

Claims 3-8 and 21-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Belfiore in view of Konig (U.S. Patent No. 6,981,040), claims 9-11 and 27-29 were rejected over Belfiore in view of Sommerer (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0003351 A1), and claims 16 and 34 were rejected over Belfiore in view of Dumais (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0267730 A1). Applicants respectfully traverse these grounds of rejection.

Konig, Sommerer and Dumais all fail to overcome the deficiencies of Belfiore. Namely, these references do not disclose “displaying the first article identifier and an additional article identifier included within the first article, the additional article identifier associated with an additional article.”

Konig discusses a way to “estimate a probability...that a document is of interest to a user, and the estimated probability is then used to provide personalized information services to the user.” (Konig, column 4, lines 20-34). In the Office Action, the Examiner cited column 17, lines 13-40 of Konig. But this section of Konig does not disclose “displaying the first article identifier and an additional article identifier included within the first article.” Instead, this section of Konig merely describes initialization of the User Model, such as

identifying documents based on web browsing history (column 17, lines 19-20), the user supplying documents (column 17, lines 41-43), and/or the user directly indicating his or her interests (column 17, lines 44-46). As such, Konig does not cure the deficiencies of Belfiore.

The Sommerer and Dumais references also fail to disclose “displaying the first article identifier and an additional article identifier included within the first article.” Sommerer discusses a browser session navigation tool that allows a user to browse previously viewed resource pages (Abstract). The Examiner cited to Figure 3 and paragraph 57 of Sommerer, but this section merely discusses a “visual aspect drop down box” that may be used to search for a visual aspect within a previously viewed resource page. The drop-down menu discussed in Sommerer, however, does not disclose “displaying the first article identifier and an additional article identifier included within the first article.”

Dumais discusses systems and methods for performing background queries. (Abstract). The Examiner cites to paragraph 34 of Dumais in the Office Action, discussing “access-based information retrieval.” Dumais simply does not mention, however, “displaying the first article identifier and an additional article identifier included within the first article.”

In addition, as discussed above, the rejection of independent claims 2, 18, and 20 are not supported by Belfiore and should be withdrawn. Claims 3-11, 16, 36 and 37 depend, either directly or indirectly from claim 2. Claims 21-29 and 34 depend, either directly or indirectly from claim 20. All of these dependent claims also include recitations that further define the claimed invention. Based on their dependence on the independent claims and other patentable recitations, these dependent claims are also patentable.

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are allowable over the cited art of record and request that the Examiner allow this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,
DAVID BENJAMIN AUERBACH, ET AL.

Date: April 19, 2007

By: /Brenda M. Simon/

Brenda M. Simon, Attorney of Record
Registration No. 48,449
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7198
Fax: (650) 938-5200
E-Mail: bsimon@fenwick.com